THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 3. JUNE, 1940. Vol. XXX.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Christian Baptism and Pagan Children.

We are glad that both Houses of the Convocation of Canterbury adopted unanimously the Report[1] of their Joint Committee recommending reforms in the administration of Infant Baptism. The Report insists that while the revised service of Infant Baptism in the *Deposited Book* was a 'marked improvement' on the service of the Prayer Book of 1662, yet it is 'still too long and too difficult for simple people to follow and understand.' They therefore recommend

> 'that a shortened and simplified alternative service for the Baptism of Infants should be drawn up and issued by lawful authority.'

We are convinced that there is very great need for this, and we hope that the new service will be as short, simple and practical as it is possible to make it. In the Primitive Church the Baptismal Service was of this kind, but unfortunately the tendency of all Church services, especially those concerned with the Sacraments, is to become more prolonged, complicated and

[1] *Report of the Joint Committee on the Administration of the Sacrament of Holy Baptism.* (S.P.C.K. 1940. Price 2*d.*)

Prayer Book Services Revised. By H. D. A. Major. (Blackwell's. 1936. 1*s.*)

What Baptism Means. By H. D. A. Major. (Blackwell's. 1*d.*)

ritualistic with the passage of time. Our English Reformers secured much purgation and abbreviation in the Baptismal Office in the *Second Prayer Book of King Edward VI*, but they were far from reducing Baptism to its primitive simplicity. Of course we cannot to-day return to the most primitive form, when all that was required of the candidate for Baptism (if an adult) was that he should believe in Jesus as the Christ and be willing to turn from his old life to a new one. He was then baptized into the name of Jesus alone. Baptism into the name of the Trinity was a later innovation but one which ought properly to be retained. The sign of the Cross made on the forehead was also later, but none would wish to see that omitted.

Baptism for the remission of sins in the case of an adult goes back to the earliest Christian times. The newly-baptized man or woman made at Baptism a new start, and the old life with its sin and guilt was left behind for ever. In the case of infants the matter is quite different. There is no former sinful life from which at Baptism the newly-baptized infant is liberated. The belief in original sin transmitted to infants is not a primitive Christian belief. Tertullian (about 200 A.D.) when arguing against the Baptism of Infants writes : 'Why does an age which is innocent hasten to the remission of sins?' (*De Baptismo*, 18). Our Saviour, whose attitude towards little children is adduced in our present Baptismal Service as a sound reason for Infant Baptism, nowhere in the Gospels asserts the sinfulness of babes. We could wish, therefore, that in the proposed new Service for Infant Baptism, in contrast to that for adult Baptism, no reference should be made to the sins or sinful condition of infants. The references to sin in our present Baptismal Service for Infants are either regarded as teaching the horrible Augustinian view of unbaptized infants as proper objects of divine damnation, or else that their pro-creation is itself sinful—a defamation of the sacred estate of matrimony.

All that the Convocation recommends in favour of the administration of the Baptismal Sacrament with becoming reverence and publicity we heartily support. Undoubtedly the Children's Service on Sunday afternoon in the Parish Church is the most suitable time for infants, parents and congregation. The use of an appropriate psalm (*e.g.* xxiii) and appropriate

hymns, and the delivery of a very short, simple, practical address on the meaning of Baptism are valuable adjuncts, as are also the giving to the parents of an attractively illuminated card and a simple booklet on baptism and its obligations.

We find ourselves less able to agree with the regulations which are put forward in the matter of sponsors. It seems to us absurd to enquire whether sponsors are baptized and confirmed and yet not to enquire whether they are communicants. We think all such enquiries will only complicate matters and possibly lead to the infant's not being brought for Baptism. Ordinary English people resent being asked questions, especially when they can only answer them as the result of putting questions to other people. From the practical point of view what ought to be required is that the parents or guardians of the infant shall promise to bring the child up as a Christian. This very proper and practical requirement our present Prayer Book service fails to secure. If the parents would also undertake to bring the child to church on Sunday that would be a great advantage. The Convocation Report speaks of the godparents 'encouraging' the baptized child to attend church. This is not enough. The parents ought to be required to promise to bring them.

We need in the Baptismal Service to stimulate and deepen the sense of parental responsibility for the child's religion. In attempting to substitute sponsorial responsibility for parental responsibility we invariably miss both targets. Besides being delusive and ineffective, the policy of substituting sponsors for parents is, we believe, without the sanction of the Primitive Church. In the *Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus*, which represents in its earliest sections the practice of the great Church of Rome about the year 200, it is directed that if the little ones brought to Baptism are unable to speak for themselves 'their parents or other relatives shall speak for them' (Easton's Edition, p. 45). What needs to be emphasized in bringing infants to Baptism is not that 'all men are from birth prone to sin' as the revised service of the *Deposited Book* (1928) expresses it; but that the infant to be baptized is a partaker of the Divine Nature and is an heir to the Kingdom of God and that Baptism is, as Robertson of Brighton proclaimed it, emphatic testimony to this. Baptism is for the infant what

Coronation is for the Sovereign: the Sovereign is crowned because he is of royal birth and the rightful heir to the throne. We need a Baptismal service which will reflect towards the children to be baptized the loving and reverential spirit of Jesus Himself towards little children, not the spirit of Augustine of Hippo and his successors.

We are convinced that the right opening for the Service of Baptism is not a question, nor a platitude, but the words of the Gospel written in *Mark* x, 13-16:

> 'They brought young children to Christ, that He should touch them: and His disciples rebuked those that brought them. But when Jesus saw it, He was much displeased, and said unto them, Suffer the little children to come unto Me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God. Verily I say unto you, whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein. And He took them up in His arms, put His hands upon them, and blessed them.'

This speaks so clearly and impressively that no explanation nor expansion of it is needed.

Miss Dorothy Sayers as Theologian.

Miss Dorothy Sayers, the writer of 'thrillers,' following the example of a number of our literary luminaries, has of late been using her reputation and gifts on behalf of the Christian religion. She first became known in this sphere by her mystical play, *The Zeal of Thine House*. Recently addressing the Church Tutorial Classes Association at Derby, she uttered an impassioned plea for the teaching of dogma by the clergy and by all those responsible for religious education in this country. Miss Sayers is seriously perturbed by the prevailing ignorance of the Christian religion by English people. She asserts, as cited in the *Church Times* report of May 10, that

> 'The brutal fact is that in this Christian country not one person in a hundred has the faintest notion what the Church teaches about God or man or society or the person of Jesus Christ. . . . But no good whatever will be done by a retreat into personal piety or by mere exhortation to a "recall to prayer." The thing that is in danger is the whole structure of society, and it is necessary to persuade thinking men and women of the vital and intimate connexion between the structure of society and the theological doctrines of Christianity.
>
> 'The task is not made easier by the obstinate refusal of a great body of nominal Christians, both lay and clerical, to face the theological question. "Take away theology and give us some nice religion" has been a popular slogan for so long that we are apt to accept it, without inquiring whether religion without theology has any meaning. And

> however unpopular I shall make myself, I shall and will affirm that the reason why the Churches are discredited to-day is, not that they are too bigoted about theology, but that they have run away from theology. . . . It is not true at all that dogma is "hopelessly irrelevant" to the life and thought of the average man. What is true is that ministers of the Christian religion often assert that it is, present it for consideration as though it were, and, in fact, by their faulty exposition of it make it so. . . .'

There is truth in Miss Sayers' charges and in her demands, but the teaching of theological dogmas dogmatically is not, we venture to think, the most influential way of inducing modern English people to become loyal Christians. In the first place, dogma has a very unpleasant sound in their ears and is associated in their minds with religious arrogance and intolerance, and if they knew more Church history than they do they would find that there is much support for their dislike of dogma. Dogma is a Greek word and has two meanings: (1) A decree enforced by authority, as for instance when St. Luke writes, 'There went out a *dogma* from Caesar Augustus that all the world should be enrolled'; (2) A philosophic axiom enunciating the foundation principle of a school of philosophy; for example, the Epicurean dogma that 'happiness is the highest good.'

With dogma in the first sense, when used of religion, modern Englishmen will have nothing to do: it offends their sense of religious freedom and the rights of the human conscience to decide what in religion it will believe and what it will not believe. There, it permits no interference from authority, whether political or ecclesiastical. It is because the ordinary Englishman believes that the Church of Rome claims this right that he will have nothing to do with her.

As for the second kind of dogma, no Englishman is opposed to it provided he is shewn in a courteous and persuasive manner that there are good reasons for its acceptance. If the clergy would teach Christian principles in a thoughtful, lucid, and modest manner, we are convinced that they would receive the serious attention of their hearers or readers. Here too often a dogmatic manner and a claim to dogmatic authority, combined with amazing ignorance, are responsible for their failure to convince.

There are various ways of teaching the Christian religion. It can be presented as a dogmatic system. This may be called the

logical method; but we are convinced that to-day, owing to the influence of the methods of inductive science, this will have little influence among our people.

A second method is the historical. This, when competently done by a teacher who uses the modern methods of historical and literary criticism, can secure attention and exert real influence, especially when dealing with the life and times, the mission and message, of great religious personalities such as Jesus Christ and the Israelite prophet.

A third method is the experimental. This presents the great affirmations of the Christian religion as working hypotheses and affirms, in the language of the Fourth Gospel, 'If any man will do God's will, he shall know of the doctrine.' This method, as Dean Inge has said, 'Begins with an experiment and ends in an experience.' And that experience becomes, as it proceeds, of so convincing a kind that the moral and spiritual life is justified, sustained and developed by it. This, we are inclined to believe in this age of metaphysical problems and conflicts of historical evidence, will prove to be the best method, at least for the beginner who is no scholar and has neither the abilities nor the leisure to become such. For this method is intensely practical and is concerned with the centre of the Christian religion, not with its circumference—with God in human experience as unveiled by Christ as a personal power and presence, not as a formulation of dogmatic theologizing.

What is needed to-day by Christian teachers is that in their teaching they should discard appeals to the authority of an infallible, dogmatic theology just as much as they should discard appeals to the authority of Biblical infallibility. These things have been in the past great supports of the Christian religion, but now they are hindrances. To-day we need a new theology, not a new religion; and that new theology, as Archbishop Frederick Temple foresaw, has got to be presented to the modern man, not logically, but psychologically:

> 'Our theology has been cast in a scholastic mould, *i.e.* all based on logic. We are in need of, and we are being gradually forced into, a theology based on psychology. The transition, I fear, will not be without much pain: but nothing can prevent it.'

The central Christian experiences are not new, but the theology which undertakes to explain them must vary from age to

age. *Non nova sed nove*, not new things but in a new manner, wrote St. Vincent of Lerins, to whom we owe the well-known definition of Catholicism. If Miss Dorothy Sayers means that there is great need for this basic Christian teaching to-day, we are altogether with her; but if she means that there is need for reiterating the traditional arguments which in the light of modern research have forfeited their validity, we are compelled to direct her to a more excellent way.

Dr. Temple on 'The New Ecumenical Creed.'

The Archbishop of York in a personal letter has kindly enlightened us as to the origin of the dogmatic formula which we criticized last month under the heading 'The New Ecumenical Creed.' Of it we wrote:

> 'Although we do not know who was the author of this new symbol it seems highly probable that it is the product of recent Continental Protestantism, as it appears to have been first formulated at Utrecht' (*M.C.*, p. 52).

Dr. Temple states:

> 'As a matter of fact its position is due to its use in the letter of invitation issued by the Protestant Episcopal Church in America in 1912 which launched the Faith and Order Movement. It has been the basis of that Movement throughout. That Movement asked to retain it for its own work, but expressly disclaimed any desire to impose it on the World Council. The Conference at Utrecht deliberately decided to retain it on the two grounds that (1) it was already familiar, (2) it is so obviously crude that no intelligent person could possibly mistake it for a theological formulation: evidently it is a pointer and no more. It is very likely that the first Assembly of the World Council will consider making a change in it.
>
> Where the American Bishops got it from I do not know: but it had been employed in some deliverance of the World Y.M.C.A. in (I think) the 1890's.
>
> It is certainly *not* a product of recent Continental Protestantism.'

We are glad to publish this authoritative statement. The origin of the formula—which is not due, as we had supposed, to 'recent Continental Protestantism' but to modern American Protestantism—is of minor importance compared with the use and content of the formula. Of its use Professor Bucham wrote in the April *Hibbert Journal* of 1940 in an article entitled 'The Creed of the World Council of Christian Churches':

> 'Over the portal of the World Council of Christian Churches has been placed, as essential to entrance, acceptance of "Our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour."'

This formula Professor Bucham shows convincingly to be hereti-

cal. Had the formula occurred in prayers, or hymns, or popular sermons, it would demand neither comment nor criticism, for it would have been merely a case of what Matthew Arnold has called 'the language of devotion,' not 'the language of dogma.' But the formula we criticized cannot excuse itself on this ground since it is definitely used for a dogmatic purpose; and, so used, is definitely excluding from membership in the Faith and Order Movement those who would otherwise be ready to become members of it. It seems to us that it is futile to seek to excuse the use of this formula by asserting that 'it is so obviously crude that no intelligent person could possibly mistake it for a theological formulation.'

What right has such a dogmatic crudity to be used in this dogmatic manner and to be assigned such an eminent position? If it expresses, as we must assume it does, the theological faith of the Faith and Order Movement, then it proclaims on its forefront that the faith of that movement is heretical. If, on the other hand, it be affirmed that the faith which it proclaims is not the faith of the Faith and Order Movement, then what is it doing in that galley? We cannot have it both ways. If it be authoritative, then it ought to be orthodox; if it be not authoritative, it ought not to be assigned such a prominent position.

We should perhaps be less vigorous in our condemnation if the formula had erred heretically because it had sought to be as inclusive as possible. But in this case its heresy, we suspect, is due to the sinister intention of being exclusive. What at any rate is perfectly plain is that in addition to being heretical dogmatically, and exclusive ecclesiastically, it is intellectually misleading. In that case it should, as we urged, be replaced as quickly as possible by a clear, orthodox and comprehensive symbol. We are glad indeed that one possessing the authority of the Archbishop of York believes that

> 'it is very likely that the first Assembly of the World Council will consider making a change in it.'

Cambridge University and the Bishop of Ely.

On May 25 the Congregation of the University of Cambridge enacted the following Grace:

> 'That the University give its consent to the principle that the Select Preachers Syndicate, in drawing up the list of preachers before

the University, may use such liberty in the choice of preachers as is exercised by Diocesan Bishops in accordance with the resolutions of the Convocations of the Church of England.'

(*Cambridge University Reporter*, May 21, 1940.)

The Grace was the outcome of the recommendation contained in the Report of the Select Preachers Syndicate dated February 18, 1937, on the choice of preachers before the University.

The Syndicate comprised nine members, of whom six were clergymen of the Church of England holding high official positions in the University of Cambridge, *viz.* G. A. Weekes, Master of Sidney Sussex College; G. A. Chase, Master of Selwyn College; C. E. Raven, Master of Christ's College and Regius Professor of Divinity; J. M. Creed, late Ely Professor; F. S. Marsh, Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity; Edwyn C. Hoskyns, late President of Corpus Christi College.

The reasoned statement for their conclusions was published in full in the *Cambridge University Reporter* of May 14, 1940. In view of the storm which has been created in certain ecclesiastical circles by the action of Cambridge University, we think it advisable to cite the Syndicate's Report in full.

'In selecting preachers to preach before the University the Syndicate have always conformed to the long established custom of limiting the choice to clergy of the Church of England. There appears, however, to be nothing in the Statutes or Ordinances of the University which makes this limitation obligatory. The only clause in the Statutes which bears upon the question is Statute B, V, 2, which lays down that "no one shall be allowed in any sermon before the University to impugn the doctrine or discipline of the Church of England as established by law." In the form of Bidding Prayer supplied to the preacher the expression occurs: "Let us pray for all the Commons of the Realm, that they may live . . . in sincere and conscientious communion with the Established Church." This form of prayer, however, is not officially authorized, and it has in fact sometimes been altered by the preacher. The limitation on the choice of preachers appears therefore to be due to custom rather than to any University regulation.

The custom of preaching in Great St. Mary's Church before the University is very ancient and is recognized in the earliest University Statutes of *c.* 1300, and until the Statutes of 1926 the University could require members of the Senate who were in Holy Orders to preach. It is true that the University Sermon was expressly excluded from the provisions of the Act of Uniformity of 1662, including the provision that preachers must be licensed by a Bishop. But in view of the religious tests then imposed upon graduates of the University, this can hardly be interpreted as being intended to throw the University pulpit open to preachers who were not members of the Church of England.

In more recent times, however, the position within the University has been changed. The religious test for graduates was abolished in

1871. In 1912 the Divinity degrees, which had hitherto been confined to clergy of the Church of England, were thrown open. And lastly, as a result of recent changes of Statutes, the Norris-Hulse Professorship of Divinity, as well as the Regius Professorship of Hebrew, had been set free from all restrictions. In consequence of these changes a Free Church minister was elected in 1935 to the Norris-Hulse Professorship. But, though he is an *ex officio* member of the Select Preachers Syndicate, the present custom does not allow of his being asked to preach.

There has also been a change in recent years in the practice of the Church of England. It is now officially recognized by Convocation that "a bishop is justified in giving occasional authorization to ministers not episcopally ordained who in his judgment are working towards an ideal of union such as is described in [the Lambeth Appeal of 1920] to preach in churches within his diocese" (*Chronicles of the Convocation of Canterbury,* 23 February 1921). A similar resolution was passed by the Convocation of York, and this was reaffirmed on 7 June 1934 with the explanation that it referred to ministers of a Christian communion "which holds the common Christian Faith which is proclaimed in the Holy Scriptures, and is witnessed to and safeguarded in the Oecumenical Creed commonly called the Nicene and in the Apostles' Creed."

It appears to the Syndicate that the University Sermon is an occasion when greater freedom in the choice of the preacher would be particularly suitable. Since the limitation is a matter of custom only, it does not seem necessary to recommend any change of Statute or Ordinance. For the Syndicate are of opinion that the requirement at present imposed on preachers (being clergymen of the Church of England), namely that they should not "impugn the doctrine or discipline of the Church of England," should be retained. But they do not think that they would be justified in departing without the consent of the University from a custom which has been so long established.

The Syndicate consider that if the University approves this wider freedom in the choice of preachers, it would be desirable to make three changes in the Bidding Prayer. The clause already referred to in which prayer is made that "all the Commons of the Realm . . . may live . . . in sincere and conscientious communion with the Established Church" would obviously be impossible for a preacher who did not himself belong to the Established Church. They consider that the words "the Church of Christ" should be substituted for the words "the Established Church." Again, whereas in the present form, when prayer is offered for "the Ministers and Dispensers of God's Holy Word and Sacraments," the preacher first makes mention of the Archbishops and Bishops, and then of "the inferior clergy, the Priests and Deacons," the Syndicate consider that it would be desirable to substitute for the latter words an ancient phrase taken from the Bidding Prayer as given in the Canons: "other Pastors and Curates." And, lastly, for the opening words of the prayer: "Let us pray for Christ's Holy Catholic Church, particularly that pure and reformed part of it established in this Kingdom," they desire that these words should be substituted: "Let us pray for Christ's Holy Catholic Church, particularly for the Church of England as by law established, and for other Congregations of faithful Christian men within this Realm."

The Syndicate fully recognize that it is undesirable that the University should become involved in ecclesiastical controversies. Since, however, the permission for which they ask does not differ from that

which is already authorized in the Church of England, they do not think that the occasional exercise of it could have this effect.'

It is somewhat astonishing that so judicious and moderate an enlargement of the panel of University preachers should have been opposed by Dr. Heywood, the Bishop of Ely, and the Rev. E. C. Essex, Vicar of Great St. Mary's and Rural Dean of Cambridge, as appears from the following letter published in the *Church Times* of May 31, 1940:

'The Council of the Senate of the University of Cambridge has just passed a Grace of which the effect is to admit others than Clerks in Holy Orders to preach the University Sermon, thus altering the practice of many centuries.

Our consent to this change has not been sought, apparently on the ground that when it is used for the University Sermon (and possibly on other occasions) the church of St. Mary the Great ceases (in effect) to be a parish church, and for the time being is not subject to the jurisdiction of the Bishop of the diocese or the vicar of the parish.

In the absence of any proof of this claim, we are unable to accept its validity; and particularly in view of future developments beyond the scope of the present Grace, we have felt compelled to send to the Vice-Chancellor a reasoned, firm and friendly protest against the implication of the Grace—at the same time regretting that controversial issue should have been raised at such a critical time in our national history.'

Even if the Bishop and Vicar are legally justified in their attempt to restrict the University in the exercise of what it believes to be an ancient right, on the ground that it infringes the episcopal and vicarial authority in the case of the University pulpit, we cannot but feel that, judged in the light of broad principles and University welfare, their protest is to be deplored. It is to the interest of the Christian religion and to its presentation in the University of Cambridge that the ablest and most influential exponents of it should be heard from the University pulpit. The University in seeking to enlarge its present panel of preachers is assisting this end, and this latest step is in entire harmony with the religious policy which Cambridge University has pursued in recent years.

Students of English Church history, who realize how much the influence of the Christian religion in this land is due to the close connection between Church and State on the one hand, and between the Church and the ancient Universities on the other, must view with deep regret, in the interests of National Religion, the growing separation of the Church from the State and from the ancient Universities; yet neither State nor Uni-

versity is to blame for this widening rift. It is due entirely to a temper of intransigent, self-conscious ecclesiasticism which the Church has been developing since the rise of the Tractarian Movement.

Fruitful and happy co-operation can only be maintained if the Church will strive to forget herself and readily and generously sacrifice her traditional privileges in the service of the larger cause of the moral and spiritual life of the nation. If individuals who seek first the Kingdom of God receive all that is needful for this life, the Church need have no fear that in her readiness to sacrifice ancient privileges and ecclesiastical prestige for the sake of the Kingdom of God, she will secure all that is needful for her life and work.

THE ULTIMATE CONFIDENCE

By Kenneth Henderson,* M.A. (Melb.), B.Litt. (Oxon).

THE quest for some fundamental loyalty and peace of mind has become desperately urgent for many sensitive and idealistic spirits whose provisional loyalties and causes do not satisfy their need for some absolute trust. The individual of this kind seeks some belief in which he can feel that 'though I perish, truth is so.' The war leads 'average sensual men' to seek some kind of escape. They eat, sleep and amuse themselves much as usual. They can listen to the sufferings of Finland or Norway on the radio and read a magazine. Mental peace for some is to be had quite cheaply at the price of spiritual death. But that challenge of pain which incites some people to run away, compels others to turn and endure it. They feel the war as a deep and tragic ordeal of mind and spirit. These are they whose minds are capable of wide horizons. Their trouble is in layers, as it were. They are troubled for a beloved country about war's daily vicissitudes, and the final outcome—the possibilities of victory, defeat or stalemate, and the cost and consequences of each. On the moral issue they feel that, though our present cause is righteous, we ourselves are very imperfectly so, and that past faults of our own have contributed somewhat to

* Mr. Henderson served as a chaplain with the Anzacs at Gallipoli in the Great War.

the crimes of our enemies. At a level deeper still, they feel that the very fact of war is a penetrating challenge to their faith in the goodness of life, the essential brotherhood of man, the power of reason to shape life, the utility of righteousness, justice and generosity, the presence of God in human life.

Those who are in pain instinctively seek relief, and each of these kinds of pain seeks its relief at its own level. Uncertainty as to the outcome of the war naturally resorts to calculations of man-power, air force expansion, naval ratings and comparisons of economic strength. No final answer can be given in those terms, for they have meaning only in so far as they are transformed into human ability and resolution. Moral misgivings are rightly transmuted into the determination that we shall do better in future, through hopeful and healthy planning of a better world informed by past mistakes. That is the wise and sane course to take, but it gives no final answer to our soul's disquiet, for any awareness of history is enough to remind us that passions generated by war are not easily set at rest, and that any pattern of human organization through which we try to solve our difficulties is going to be troubled and to some extent confused by national, sectional and private selfishness, by moral cowardice, stupidity and inertia. Not before this planet freezes in the face of a dying sun will the world be safe for democracy, or fascism, or communism, or capitalism, or socialism, or any other shape of society yet to be conceived. The forces of disintegration are always working against the forces of vitality in them all. Each pattern of conduct is being disturbed by the seven deadly sins —pride, lust, anger, greed and the rest. Each is being pulled out of its original shape by its idealists from the top and its sinners from the bottom. Plato would persuade democrats to surrender their power to philosophers, H. G. Wells to scientists. But all human power is subject to corruption. By no external battlements, however well-designed and necessary for the moment, can we secure the City of Mansoul.

The final faith that gives us the integrity to live well, with a courage and integrity unbroken and unembittered, is attained through a progressive disillusionment. We must not put our whole trust in breakable ideas. It is, for example, bad history and bad theology to believe that God will always give the victory

to any cause at any moment because it is just. The conviction that our cause is just is a heartening thing very powerful for success, but the fact that, according to the American journal *Time*, ninety-six per cent. of the Finns are church members did not give them victory over the superior fire-power of the Russians. Material forces, even when swung by man's spirit, are subject to the laws of cause and effect.

This progressive disillusionment is relative. It does not say that the fate of Finland does not matter to the world, or that because democracy and fascism are both shot through with sin the conflict between them does not matter, and that one is as bad as the other. Obviously the issue between them is spiritual life or death for millions of people, and matters intensely to everyone now born. But what we have called progressive disillusionment does forbid us to say that, if we cannot get victory in our time for this cause or that, we shall withdraw all faith and loyalty from life, and live without any meaning but egotism. As Rheinhold Niebuhr writes in his book *Beyond Tragedy* :

> 'Faced with the indubitable fact of human history that there is no human vitality which is not subject to decay and no human virtue which is not subject to corruption, hope in the meaninglessness of human existence must be nourished by roots which go deeper than the deserts of history, with their periodic droughts.'
>
> 'It is not without significance,' says the same thinker, 'that the real saints of history, as distinguished from the morbid self-flagellating ascetics, have a delightful sense of humour, as had Francis of Assisi, for example. This sense of humour is based on a curious quality of disillusionment which has not resulted in either bitterness or despair. . . . It is without despair, because no evils in the world can disturb the firm faith in the goodness of God and His ultimate triumph over evil. This quality . . . has looked into the abyss of evil and is no longer frightened by it.'

But whence, we may ask, comes their faith? They do not believe in a Deity who manages everything, and leaves human freedom only as an illusion. 'They do not preach that their God will rouse them a little before the nuts work loose.' The spirit that God breathed into man is free, and as the sowing so shall be the reaping. For such people the world, though corrupted by evil, is good because it is a place and an opportunity to love and serve. Man, though weakened and corrupted by evil, is good because he is capable of responding to goodness, can dignify, immortalize and partially realize his ideals by serving,

suffering and maybe dying for them. To them God's goodness is manifest in the order of creation, through 'the love that moves the sun and the other stars,' in the laws and principles of human life in obedience to which men can live the good life together. But the clearest and most intimate revelation of His goodness is that He is the strength and stay of those who trust Him, the underlying reality and source of their aspirations, their guide through the complexities of life, the Friend whose companionship in the changing circumstances of life makes these facts of storm and sunshine the revelations of fresh possibilities of love and courage, wisdom and peace. This is what St. Paul means when he says that 'all things work together for good to them that love God.'

This final faith that evil cannot overcome good is manifest in the Cross of Calvary. In His early thirties the mission of Jesus was brought to an end and His life crushed by the forces of evil. The evidence goes to show that He felt most intensely for the fate of His earthly work. He was not indifferent to His own fate. We hear the prayer in Gethsemane: 'Father, all things are possible to Thee, remove this cup from me: howbeit not what I will but what thou wilt.' And on the Cross itself the cry 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' unites Him to all idealists who suffer in the fate of their aims. We see an intense devotion to the advancement of God's kingdom on earth together with an underlying submission to the divine will. Love to the limit meets with historic defeat and thereby gains an immortal persuasiveness that will disturb and inspire men, in the midst of their imperfections, for ever. The Resurrection story symbolizes the release of this love from its historic limits to become a universal and undying force of redemption.

This final confidence, therefore, is no withdrawal or detachment from the causes through which goodness tries to realize itself in history. This final confidence sends us back to our causes, and gives them new meaning as part of a wider purpose. They now matter more, not less. But it delivers our hearts from complete bondage to the success or failure of the moment's purpose, and reveals in our particular aims for the world's improvement an underlying Energy which our freedom gives us the power to refuse or accept.

THE RELIGION OF MRS. GASKELL

By the Rev. F. H. Amphlett Micklewright, M.A.

VICTORIAN novelists have much to teach about religious problems. They passed through a period of transition and, in many cases, formed links between the old and the new. Their insight into contemporary religious problems affords help to a thinking out of the problems as they still exist in contemporary guise. Dickens, in the person of the clergyman of Dingley Dell, has, possibly unwittingly, illustrated official religion as what it must always be—a merely decorative background to life, inoffensive to those who, like Queen Victoria's first Prime Minister, Lord Melbourne, have a strong objection to the interference of religion with private life! Or again, in the guise of the Rev. Mr. Chadband or the Rev. Mr. Stiggins, Dickens has pictured that objectionable form of conventional piety which is to be found in other churches besides those of English dissent. Mrs. Gaskell has likewise illustrated the religion of her period. But her religious background was vastly different to that of Dickens: it had more in common with Mrs. Humphry Ward. To Mrs. Gaskell, liberal religion became wedded to the problems of a great industrial city. She was anxious to present the Christian Faith in broad form and likewise to apply it to the distresses which accompanied the industrial revolution and the cotton famine.

Elizabeth Cleghorn Stevenson was born on September 29th, 1810, at a house in Lindsey Row (now Cheyne Walk), Chelsea. She was the daughter of an interesting father, William Stevenson, who had started life as a Unitarian minister. In common with many other dissenting ministers of the period, he was forced to seek a means of livelihood at the same time in some other occupation. He turned to farming; many years later providing his daughter with a picture of a minister-farmer in *Cousin Phillis*. Stevenson was a man of parts. He wrote upon commerce and, later on settling in London, became keeper of the Records to the Treasury of London, a post in which he continued his literary work.

Mrs. Gaskell's mother died within a month of the birth of her daughter, who was later taken into the care of her mother's sister, Mrs. Lumb, residing at Heathside, Knutsford, in the Cheshire plain. In spite of the fact that the heath is hemmed in by the modern housing estate of the little town, Heathside still stands and, externally, appears much the same as in Mrs. Gaskell's day. Later, she was educated at a boarding-school at Stratford-on-Avon, and spent two winters with the family of Mr. Turner, the well-known Unitarian minister of Newcastle-on-Tyne. William Turner was a man of scientific attainments who inspired not a little of the work of George Stephenson.

In 1832 Elizabeth Cleghorn was married in Knutsford Parish Church to the Rev. William Gaskell, of Cross Street Chapel, Manchester. At that time marriages were still forbidden in dissenting meeting-houses, and Mrs. Gaskell was unable to be married at the Unitarian Chapel, at the foot of Adam's Hill, which she had constantly attended. Her marriage was happy, and for many years she shared the wide prominence of her husband in the social, charitable and philanthropic work of Manchester. From that time her home was constantly within the city, at Dover Street, Rumford Street, then lastly at 84 Plymouth Grove, Chorlton-on-Medlock, a house which is still standing. She died quite suddenly in 1865, whilst conversing with a daughter. She was buried in the chapel-yard at Knutsford, whilst a funeral-sermon was preached at Cross Street by Dr. James Drummond, later Principal of Manchester College, Oxford.

Mrs. Gaskell became an authoress soon after her marriage by the publication of 'Midland Scenes' in William Howitt's *Visits to Remarkable Places*, whose Quaker editor was well-known for his *A Popular History of Priestcraft*, a book which, after the lapse of a century, still provides a notable attack upon sacerdotalism. The death of a small son led her to relieve her grief in further writing. The result was *Mary Barton*, which, appearing anonymously in 1848, proved an instantaneous success even though Messrs. Chapman and Hall had seemed to prophesy a very different fate for it by their high-handed treatment of the manuscript. The real problems of the workman and the manufacturer in the great northern city were laid bare in this epic of the industrial revolution. Good and bad types were

sketched in each class. Mrs. Gaskell had every reason to know the better type of employer, as he existed in many of her Unitarian connections, such as the Greg's of Styal. This book led to Mrs. Gaskell being received in London literary circles and to her friendship with Dean Stanley and Professor Jowett. In 1850 she wrote *Lizzie* and *The Moorland Cottage*, and in 1853 *Ruth* and *Cranford* appeared. It is by *Cranford* that the authoress is best remembered, and in it Mrs. Gaskell showed herself as a humorist of a dry kind. She described with humour and pathos the narrow and restricted life of a small country town with its social conventions which appear so needlessly repressive to those who have lived in the wider world. Cranford is Knutsford, and, in the incident of 'poor Peter,' Mrs. Gaskell has recalled the brother whom she had lost at sea many years before. The centre of Knutsford still looks much as it did then, though contact with Manchester has probably robbed it of many of the petty deceptions of a social type embalmed by Mrs. Gaskell. In 1855 appeared *North and South*, and in 1857 the *Life of Charlotte Brontë*, Mrs. Gaskell's one important work outside the realm of fiction. In *North and South* she has returned to the subject of Lancashire and its manufactures at the time of the crisis due to the cotton famine. A few smaller works came from her pen, and her last story, *Grey Woman*, was appearing in the *Cornhill Magazine*, when she died.

The religious background of Mrs. Gaskell was definitely Unitarian. The Rev. William Turner was a Unitarian belonging to the older school of Priestley. He was associated with Biblical Unitarianism, expounding his faith in terms of a Socinian reading of the Bible but refusing to step beyond the printed page into wider speculation. This theological school was supernaturalist and insisted upon the historicity of miracles. Its last distinguished representative was Dr. J. R. Beard, author of *The Autobiography of Satan*. The philosophical theology and Biblical criticism of Dr. Martineau and of J. J. Taylor finally replaced it. The Rev. William Gaskell had been educated at Glasgow University and Manchester New College. He had much to do with the foundation of both Owen's College and the Unitarian Home Missionary Board (now the Unitarian College, Manchester), of which he was later Principal. He was an able

teacher of English literature, though his own publications were few and mainly of the pamphlet type. Cross Street was his one ministry. Although a moderate conservative in his theology, his long friendship with Dr. Martineau places him fundamentally within the liberal camp. He was keenly interested in all social endeavour.

The growth of liberal religious and social influences in the mind of Mrs. Gaskell may be partly attributed to the teaching and work of her husband. It is this influence which may be traced in her novels. Together with many Unitarians of the period, she recognized that social betterment must be infused by the spirit of a living religion. It is clear from her writings that religion, to Mrs. Gaskell, meant the meeting of a moral and spiritual challenge. It never meant dogmatism, sectarianism, or credalism. The insolent, proud, dominating Mr. Carson, the young manufacturer in *Mary Barton*, represents a type only too common during the industrial revolution.

> 'He was the only son, and his sisters were proud of him; his father and mother were proud of him: he could not set up his judgement against theirs: he was proud of himself.'

His behaviour as an employer was as unlovely as the character which had been evoked. But if Mrs. Gaskell drew such a character as a typical employer — hard, narrow, grasping, ignorant of the finer graces — she likewise drew the good Mr. Thornton of *North and South*, a man deeply conscious of his social obligations, a type produced by many of the finer Unitarian homes and possibly the greatest Unitarian contribution to the life of the North of England.

Mrs. Gaskell disclaimed any knowledge of political economy: 'I know nothing of Political Economy, or the theories of trade,' she writes in her Preface to *Mary Barton*. She did not seek to expound any economic system. She was profoundly moved by the clash of interests between employer and employee which threatened to overwhelm the working-classes of the industrial North. Her novel was a sermon upon the moral issues involved in such a condition.

It is significant that the Preface to *Mary Barton* is dated October, 1848. The break-up of the Chartist movement under the fantastic leadership of Feargus O'Connor had spread a feel-

ing of dismay among operatives. It was the period of *Alton Locke* — a period of disintegration and upheaval. Orthodox liberalism was unable to meet the situation. *The Manchester Guardian* of that day could only reprove Mrs. Gaskell for the morbid sensibility which the novel showed towards the condition of the working classes. Conventional religion was quite unable to cope with the industrial crisis. Orthodox Anglicanism proved to be in this sphere a great failure. Neither the leaders of the Oxford Movement nor Bishop Wilberforce had any effective social message. The Clapham Sect, save within the sphere of the foreign slave trade, achieved no social reforms. Indeed, William Wilberforce supported such political reaction as the Combination Acts. The work of Lord Shaftesbury largely found support outside evangelical ranks and was not always approved by his co-religionists. The Methodist Revival produced a second generation who blocked the way to the taking part in any effective measures for social reform. The social reform party within the Churches consisted of Unitarians of the type of Mrs. Gaskell and Broad Churchmen like Maurice and Kingsley, who were anathematized by their fellow-Churchmen. Although Dr. Martineau was a cautious political liberal of the *laissez faire* school with advanced politics, and who came later to agree with Disraeli, yet his very real liberality of sentiment threw him on to the side of social amelioration. Mrs. Gaskell contributed to Maurice's magazine, *The Christian Socialist*, which pleaded the cause which was gaining ground among advanced religious thinkers, that the influence of religion should aim at securing juster social conditions.

It is in this light that *Cranford* must be viewed. Mrs. Gaskell had poured forth her soul in *Mary Barton*. It is true that the novel had all the defects of the Victorian novelists—wooden characters uttered moral platitudes—but it did impress upon its audience the condition of the working-classes of Manchester in 1848, a picture far more vivid than that painted by Friedrich Engels in his famous treatise, *The Working-classes of England in 1844*. In the light of this picture we see that the authoress was stung by the moral futility of such lives as she had known in Knutsford. Her book does not suggest reaction against the religion of her girlhood. The old Unitarian chapel

is sketched with loving memory in *Ruth*. But it does represent a denunciation of moral futility. Mrs. Gaskell never shows any interest in theological dogmatics. She was concerned with a period of industrial revolution, and it was this that moved her to become a notable preacher for moral and social reform inspired by the Christian religion.

The importance of Mrs. Gaskell for modern religion is that she set forth permanent elements of stability for social life in a period during which much that had seemed permanent was breaking up. Chalcedonian orthodoxy could no longer claim assent whilst the old views of the Bible were undergoing overwhelming defeat. It is only one step from *Mary Barton*, where religion fulfils itself in social amelioration, to *Essays and Reviews* and the great nineteenth century revolt headed by Darwin. The break-up has been continuous, and it is generally agreed that the present period is 'the end of an age.' It is clear that static dogmas must be shaken down as soon as they are erected. Religion may learn a great deal from Mrs. Gaskell. It must commence within the individual, but its true testing will be its application to the social conditions of the time and the extent to which it challenges social failure to achieve an ever-deepening and extending standard of morality. The prophetic voices of F. D. Maurice and Mrs. Gaskell awakened the soul of the English people at a time when conventional dogmatic religion was powerless to interfere in a life and death struggle. They did so by piercing beyond the conventional expressions of religion and reaching forth to fundamental issues. Once again a life and death struggle is proceeding for the soul of England. The failure of secular Chartism shows that a materialist solution, such as that of the Marxist or the Fascist, is inadequate and cannot grant security. Conventional orthodoxy is likewise powerless. The broad and humane approach of such distinctive Christians as Mrs. Gaskell is needed.

BEYOND GOOD AND EVIL

By the Rev. G. F. Allen, Lecturer in Theology, Canton Union Theological College; sometime Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford.

A FORTNIGHT ago, in the distant mountains of West China to which we have moved our college, there reached me a copy of Berdyaev's great book *The Destiny of Man*. One main theme in this book, the theme suggested by the title of this article, seems to me so important as to be worth further reflection and expansion.

Let us start with its relationship to the ultimate Christian metaphysic. God is beyond good and evil. The Bible starts, 'In the beginning God.' It does not start, 'In the beginning God and the devil.' In the Christian scheme evil exists only by the permissive will of God; it is not a second ultimate force, equal to God, and fighting in eternal opposition against Him. There is much in Christian tradition which suggests a permanent conflict of two opposing powers; and occasionally such thoughts find their way into the later passages in the Bible. They come, however, from Babylonian mythology or from later Persian sources. In the central Biblical tradition God alone is Lord of all at the outset of creation; and just because of this ultimate monism, there is the certainty that God will remain victor of all, as the creative process moves to its conclusion.

Let us then turn to the first act in the divine cosmic drama, the original order of Creation. If we consider the stories of Creation and the Fall as science or history, it is obvious that they are, as we should expect, primitive and inaccurate. It is not, however, their purpose to give science or history, but rather to give myth. Myth is the description in pictorial terms of inner spiritual and psychological truth. If we consider these stories in this light, and penetrate to their real meaning, we shall be amazed at the brilliant accuracy of their insight. In the Creation story one detail is at first sight very obscure. We have come to regard the knowledge of good and evil as essential to human nature. We regard the clear discernment between good and evil as the essential mark of the mature and profound religious con-

sciousness. Why then in the first purpose of God are Adam and Eve forbidden to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil? Berdyaev writes:

> 'The problem of ethics cannot even be formulated unless it be admitted that the distinction between good and evil had an origin in time, and had been preceded by a state of being "beyond" or "prior to" good and evil.'[1]

The meaning of this strange feature of the Creation myth will become clearer as we proceed. For the moment we may notice two places in our present world where we seem to preserve traces of the primitive life 'prior to' good and evil. At times we cannot but feel a beauty and a simplicity in the animal world, which accepts the givenness of the whole created order in natural innocence, and which knows nothing of our moral distinctions. Walt Whitman felt the attractiveness of this natural acceptance of the world when he wrote:

> 'I think I could turn and live with animals, they are so placid and self-contained;
> I stand and look at them and long.
> They do not sweat and whine about their condition;
> They do not lie awake in the dark and weep for their sins;
> They do not make me sick discussing their duty to God.'

We find a second trace of the life 'prior to' good and evil in the attractive innocence of small children. The disconcerting directness of the child's questions, before it has become infected with the shame of an adult world, in fact puts to shame those who feel and create such shame.

Very curiously, yet also, as we begin to see, very truly, the first step in the Fall is the eating of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. There comes the birth of moral judgments. Berdyaev comments: 'It is the Fall that made moralists of us.'[2] The immediate result of such moralism is the birth of the sense of shame. The innocence of man is broken. He suffers from a divided personality. One half of his nature becomes ashamed of the other half. His moral life becomes ashamed of the physical and instinctive life, which, however, God has made, and seen and called good. With a true insight, wholly endorsed by modern psychological study, the Fall Myth sees that such conflict and false shame begin in the realm of sex.

[1] Berdyaev, *The Destiny of Man*, p. 47. [2] *op. cit.*, p. 47.

'The discoveries of psycho-pathology,' writes Berdyaev, 'are wholly in keeping with the Christian doctrine of original sin.'[3] We recognize that in this particular field the distinction of good and evil, and the prudery and false shame of the adult civilized world, are both morally and psychologically far less healthy than the unspoiled innocence of the child mind. It may be that in other fields, too, our moral distinctions and judgments and shames are not as truly moral as they seem.

The world, however, has taken the step into moralism, and there is no retracing that step. The knowledge of good and evil becomes fixed and hardened as law. The law may represent either the ethical law, or the codifying of this in social organization as the law of the land. In both forms the law now plays an important part in civilization. It serves to restrain the evil forces in the heart of man; it restrains the assault of man on man, and so makes freedom possible. As Christians we must still affirm the law and maintain the law. 'The real tragedy of ethics,' writes Berdyaev, 'lies in the fact that the law has its own positive mission in the world. It cannot be simply rejected or denied.'[4] It was the heresy of Marcion to seek to make Christianity only and wholly a religion of Grace, and to dispense with the Old Testament with its earlier religion of justice and law. When we look into its inner theological nature, modern pacifism is a revival of the Marcionite heresy. Pacifism, like the Marcionite heresy, seeks to dispense with the realm of law and with the enforcing of justice by the sanctions of force; it seeks to live only and wholly in a realm of mercy and grace. The Church, however, rightly rejected the Marcionite heresy. We must as Christians seek so to change the heart of man through grace that he no longer needs the restraints of force checking his tendency toward evil. Nevertheless, while living and working in a realm of grace, we must also be realist with regard to the unredeemed forces of evil which grace has not yet changed; we must therefore also maintain and minister the law with its sanctions, to hold these evil forces in check, both within the state by a police force, and between states in the use of force in defence of justice. At the same time, at every moment we shall recognize and feel the inadequacy of the law. As St. Paul saw once for

[3] *op. cit.*, p. 88.

[4] *op. cit.*, p. 119.

all, the law is at best one side of a divided personality, and cannot of itself heal our inner conflicts. The law can tell us that we ought to love; yet if we love under law, we shall not truly be loving, for true love is never an external conformity to the standards of law, but always a free, spontaneous growth from the heart.

The law with its restrictions is essential in a fallen world, but it still belongs to the order of a fallen world. Beyond the law, there is the order of redemption. In popular religion we think that the work of redemption is to make us good; it would be much more true to regard redemption as the step toward the order that is 'beyond good and evil.' The word of redemption is heard when Christ says, 'Did no man condemn thee? Neither do I condemn thee.' The redemptive process takes place when for the goodness which judges and condemns evil we substitute the love that understands and forgives and accepts. Does that mean that we no longer take sin seriously, and no longer call evil evil? Far from it! It remains one part of our Christian task to uphold the law, to maintain moral standards, and to oppose all action, individual or social, which falls below these standards. The preaching of redemption does, however, mean that we take forgiveness seriously. As Dale long ago pointed out, the counter-charge, 'Do you mean that I can go on sinning?' could never arise over against the moral exhortations to be good which to-day form so large a part of our Christian preaching. This counter-charge, 'Shall we continue in sin?' does, however, arise over against the Pauline preaching of the Atonement. It follows logically that our Christian moralism cannot be the same as the gospel which St. Paul preached. We have turned Christianity back into a religion of law. It also follows that if this counter-charge can arise when we say that redemption is the path toward an order 'beyond good and evil,' then we may be coming close again to the original Christian message which first provoked such a counter-charge. The fact is that the gospel of forgiveness tones down rather than intensifies the moral condemnation of evil. It does not, however, therefore cease to regard evil as evil. It succeeds instead in curing evil, which the law had failed to do. Thus to the words, 'Neither do I condemn thee,' it can add the further words, 'Go thy way; from henceforth sin no more.'

It seems a little ungracious to notice defects in a book which abounds on every page in brilliant and accurate insights. It seems to me, however, that there are two small blind spots in Berdyaev's book; and one of these we must now mention. We have already noticed his recognition of the way in which modern psychology endorses traditional Christian theology. In one place, speaking of the contributions of different groups to the study of anthropology, he says: 'Among men of science the first place belongs to Freud, Adler and Jung.'[5] There is, however, a curious blind spot when he says: 'Psycho-analysts know nothing of the mystery of the remission of sins.'[6] It is true that modern psychological work has in the main been developed outside the Christian tradition and the Christian Church. It has therefore no explicit faith in the Atonement. The work of the cure of the guilt-laden soul will take place with fuller ease and fuller power when it is brought into its proper setting in the faith in the word of forgiveness, spoken by God in Christ. It is, however, an unfortunate fact of our confused world that a formal faith can sometimes exist without the corresponding life, and that a life of love can sometimes exist outside its proper setting in the membership and faith of the Church. Many who believe theoretically in the Atonement have failed as yet to let its lessons sink deep into the structure of their own character, transforming their own nature into a wise and merciful love. Many who have the reality of forgiveness in their mind and character have failed to discern as yet the true source of this forgiveness in the Cross of Christ. In the parable of the Sheep and Goats, as elsewhere, it is the actual life of love and not the theoretic faith which Christ commends. In modern psycho-therapy we shall find a great deal which in actual fact both accepts and explains the redemptive process of healing through forgiveness. Dr. Melanie Klein writes in *Psycho-Analysis To-day*:

> 'We must assume that it is the excessive severity and overpowering cruelty of the super-ego, not the weakness or want of it, as is usually supposed, which is responsible for the behaviour of anti-social and criminal persons.'[7]

This sentence exactly expresses in technical terms the view that the path of redemption comes, not by enhancing moral stand-

[5] *op. cit.*, p. 64.
[6] *op. cit.*, p. 95.
[7] *Psycho-Analysis To-day*, p. 153.

ards, but rather by substituting for the morality that judges and condemns the love that understands and forgives. I know of no better statement of the Christian process of conversion and salvation through forgiveness than the sentence in Jung's book, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*:

> 'The patient does not feel himself accepted unless the very worst in him has been accepted too.'[8]

The healing of the conflict between good and evil comes when we learn from Christ to interpret goodness as mercy, and when therefore the good within us regards the evil within us with eyes that forgive. The goal of redemption is then to lead us on through progressive sanctification into salvation. Salvation is the final act in the divine drama. We now notice in this final stage the significance of the statement that our ultimate goal is 'beyond good and evil.'

Let us notice, first, that the final stage, which we may call salvation or heaven or paradise, means at the same time the recovery of the first stage of the original order of creation. It is not without reason that some of the conventional pictures of paradise are drawn from the Garden of Eden. In the last chapter of the Bible, in the description of the abode of the Blessed, we find the tree of life which we first saw growing in the Garden of Eden. In the teaching of Christ, if we would enter the Kingdom we must 'turn and become as little children.' The Kingdom means the recovery of the childlike mind, with its simplicity, its innocence, its directness and sincerity, its shame-free acceptance of the world as God made it. Berdyaev therefore comments: 'Salvation means rising above the distinction between good and evil, which is the result of the Fall.'[9] He says later: 'The earliest past and the final future come together in the idea of paradise.'[10] The final stage of salvation is a deeper, richer, wiser thing for having passed through the Fall and Redemption. We shall say, *O felix culpa*, as we think of the lessons of grace, which we could only have learnt through our own need and our own receiving of grace. In actual fact, those who have sinned and repented and been converted receive a depth of inner experience which they can then richly use in aiding others to receive liberation from sin. In technical doctrine the gifts re-

[8] Jung, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, p. 270.
[9] *op. cit.*, p. 128.
[10] *op. cit.*, p. 360.

stored through the Cross are greater than those lost through the Fall. Yet in its essential nature the final order of salvation is the recovery of the lost order of creation, and, like it, is 'beyond good and evil.'

We have noticed one small blind spot in Berdyaev's otherwise brilliant exposition: there seems to be a second blind spot where he just shrinks from carrying this doctrine through to its full conclusion. He writes in one place:

> 'When a man is enjoying the gratification of sexual passion or the pleasure of eating, he ought to feel the presence of poison and be reminded of original sin.' [11]

In keeping with this he writes elsewhere:

> 'Sexual life is connected with shame, and this proves that it has its origin in the Fall. The shame and terror that one sex has for the other is overcome either positively through love, *i.e.* through sublimation of shame, or through depravity, *i.e.* the loss of shame.' [12]

It is true that the shame over sex belongs to the Fall. Modern psychological study wholly endorses the Christian tradition, in seeing the great place which this shame plays in the fallen and unhealthy human consciousness. It is not, however, true that sex itself belongs to the Fall. This is a curious misreading of the *Genesis* myth, and simply shows how long the false shame of sex can linger in a fallen world. Christ endorses the true account of the *Genesis* myth, that sex belongs to the original order of creation, when he says 'male and female created He them.' Therefore the loss of shame over sex is not depravity, but rather the recovery of innocence. Berdyaev has not seen here the meaning in this sphere of the life 'beyond good and evil.' It is both true to the theology of the *Genesis* myth and of our Lord's endorsement of it, and also immensely important from the point of view of psychological health, to see that it is possible and right to give religious education concerning the sexual life of man, as something purely natural, 'prior to' and 'beyond good and evil,' and wholly without shame.

Berdyaev is far more sound when he sees the ethic of the life 'beyond good and evil' as the ethic of creativeness. He interprets the phrase that the Creator 'made man in His image' as meaning that God intended man also to be creative. From a psychological point of view we may interpret this ethic as the

[11] *op. cit.*, p. 179. [12] *op. cit.*, p. 299.

radical integration of duty and desire. Morality no longer exists as an alien system over against the forces of instinct; the creative energies and desires of the instincts are released into an outgoing love, and become one with our sense of duty. In this way the realm of Grace, as the New Testament teaches, is both the end of the law and yet also the fulfilment of the law. We are no longer under the law, in the sense that we no longer live under obedience to a duty which is in perpetual conflict with our desires. Nevertheless we fulfil the law, for we live in the freedom of spontaneous love that life for which the law stood, but which the law could never of itself attain while it exacted an unwilling obedience.

Very important are the consequences of the order 'beyond good and evil' for social morality and organization. The distinction of good and evil exists first as a distinction between ego-ideal and instinct, between duty and desire, within the individual mind. Very easily this distinction within the individual is turned into a social distinction. We then divide the society of men into the good and the evil. We find this social division entering sharply into Judaism in the apocalyptic literature, just at the time when the cosmological dualism between good and evil powers was also entering in from Persian sources. Already in *Daniel* there is the division of those who rise to everlasting life and those who rise to shame and everlasting contempt. Fairly certainly this division of the good and the evil has corrupted the explanations of some of the parables of Christ. It seems to me fairly certain that the parables of the Tares and the Drag-net originally referred to the mixture of good and evil within each individual heart; that it is a misinterpretation when *Matthew*, following as he often does the apocalyptic tradition, makes the parables refer to the division between good men and evil men at the last judgment. In point of fact no men are thus wholly good or wholly evil. It is significant that the ethic of redemption abolishes this sharp distinction and replaces it by a double universalism. 'God hath shut up all unto disobedience, that He might have mercy upon all.' In the profound exposition of Karl Barth, even the rigid Calvinist doctrine of double predestination does not drive a distinction between good men and evil men. Barth writes in the *Römerbrief*:

> 'The double predestination is the secret of all mankind, not of this or of that man, but rather in it all men together find their deepest fellowship. Over against this secret all stand on one line. Over against it Jacob is in each moment of time also Esau, and Esau is in the eternal moment also Jacob. In God we know what such twofold quality means; not a passive equilibrium, but the eternal overthrowing of judgment by grace, of hate by love, of death by life.' [13]

Human society, rightly understood, is beyond the divisions of good and evil. This also is a lesson not irrelevant in time of war. In war all too easily we fall back into those apocalyptic divisions which were themselves born in time of war. We conceive our own cause as wholly good; as the war advances, we come more and more to regard our enemy as wholly evil. It is the most urgent task of the Church at such a time to preserve the double universalism of the ethic of grace; and only as we do so shall we prepare for an enduring peace. If it is a question of sin, we also with the enemy have sinned and are evil. If it is a question of Grace and Mercy, the enemy also with ourselves receives the forgiveness of God, and in that forgiveness we may find together the possibility of co-operation to restore the damage that our warfare has caused.

Finally, our vision is thrown forward, beyond human society on earth to the ultimate fellowship of the redeemed in heaven. Here also we see the final vision of the life 'beyond good and evil,' and in that vision we may find new light for life on earth. Recently I have been studying again for some lectures the *Apocalypse*. I have felt again, as I have felt before, how closely this book follows the vindictive judgment of the good against the wicked, characteristic of Jewish apocalyptic; how little it seems to have understood the universalism of the mercy of Christ. We cannot picture the Christ who spoke to the woman in adultery resting content while those who have received the mark of the beast for worshipping Rome are 'tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb.' The Christ we meet in the Gospels would cross over to minister to their torments, and to welcome them back into forgiveness. Berdyaev is particularly clear and strong in his treatment of Heaven and Hell. From a subjective point of view, it is a condition of love that we should be free, and a con-

[13] Barth, *Römerbrief*. A free translation of the comment on *Rom.* ix, 13.

dition of freedom that we should be able to reject God's love and to choose for ourselves the hell of separation from His love. Therefore Berdyaev writes: 'Paradoxical as it sounds, hell is the normal postulate of man's spiritual freedom.'[14] Yet from the objective point of view we cannot conceive of the God of Love consigning men to eternal torment. Hence 'from the point of view of God, there cannot be any hell. To admit hell would be to deny God.'[15] When the good complacently and contentedly consign the wicked to hell, they are making judgments 'from this side the distinction between good and evil'; they have not yet seen the true goodness, which is the forgiveness which crosses and bridges that distinction. Berdyaev cannot find words strong enough to condemn the self-satisfied religion of those religious groups who regard themselves as the good, and who consign all those outside their ranks to the torments of hell.

> 'It is wrong to be conscious of oneself as abiding in the camp of the saved and the elect. The idea of hell is connected precisely with this division of the world into the two camps — of the good and the wicked.'[16]
>
> 'This separation of the fate of the "good" from the fate of the "wicked" is the greatest perversion of a morality generally acknowledged to be very lofty.'[17]
>
> 'Let the good cease being lofty, idealistic avengers.'[18]

Berdyaev sees clearly that if the good were truly loving, they could not thus consign the wicked to hell, but would want to cross over to their side.

> 'Paradise is impossible for me if the people I love, my friends or relatives or mere acquaintances, will be in hell—if Boehme is in hell as a "heretic," Nietzsche as "an anti-Christ," Goethe as a "pagan" and Pushkin as a "sinner." Roman Catholics who cannot take a step in their theology without Aristotle are ready to admit with perfect complacency that, not being a Christian, Aristotle is burning in hell. All this kind of thing has become impossible for us, and that is a tremendous moral progress. If I owe so much to Aristotle or Nietzsche I must share their fate, take their torments upon myself and free them from hell.'[19]

The pictures of the future world are closely connected with the lessons which we have learnt and are learning in this world; when we have learnt to be generous in our thoughts towards our religious or political enemies in a future life, we may be gener-

[14] *op. cit.*, p. 339. [16] *op. cit.*, p. 145. [18] *op. cit.*, p. 357.
[15] *op. cit.*, p. 341. [17] *op. cit.*, p. 350. [19] *op. cit.*, p. 351.

ous toward them in practice in our immediate situation. The warfare in the outward world of society is closely connected with the warfare in the inward heart of man. We judge others when we are inwardly in conflict and judging ourselves. We shall cease to divide the world into the good and the evil, and to make eternal warfare between them, when we have learnt the forgiveness which will both heal the inward warfare between good and evil in our heart and also heal the warfare between the divided groups in human society. There is a beautiful poem by Rose Fyleman, which the late Dick Sheppard included in his anthology *Fiery Grains*,[20] and which exactly expresses the leading theme in Berdyaev's book and the conclusion to which we have now come :

If you came to heaven
And I was not there,
You would patiently sit down
(Heeding not the angels' frown)
Where you still might watch the gate,
Saying, 'I will wait.'

And when still I came not
You would rise and go
(Turning never once your eyes
Back to vanishing Paradise),
With the smile I know so well,
Steadfast, into Hell.

And with head uplifted,
Walking very straight,
You would come where I should sit
In the middling-sinners pit
All disconsolate,
And would swiftly fold me there
In your gentle care :

Saying, 'But how came I
Carelessly to make
(Were you very lonely, dear,
While you sat and waited here?)
Such a strange mistake?
Tell me that I am forgiven ;
This, of course, is Heaven.'

[20] Longmans Green & Co.

JOHN RICHARD WILKINSON

(Second Notice)

In the last *Modern Churchman* a fine, generous tribute to John Wilkinson was paid by one of his younger friends, Mr. Seamer. As, perhaps, John's oldest friend I should like to confirm that appreciation, and to say how glad I am that a younger generation should step out and so beautifully declare their reverence for one whom they had found to be their teacher and guide.

There is in John's record one virtue which did not call for Mr. Seamer's detailed notice, but which I have often observed with deep satisfaction. It was his extraordinary faithfulness as a parish clergyman. Those six hundred simple country people of Winford, with their hidden, quiet English virtues, were for him a tremendous trust; they were a large family and he was the head; they had their faults, so had he; he, the scholar, was there to *serve* them, to judge them by Gospel standards, to love them good and bad. I know the parish very well; the respect for him was undemonstrative, but profound; his influence through thirty-seven years was for all kindly human things illumined, often without a word, from above; his hope for Winford was 'full of immortality.'

'So glorious let thy Pastors shine,
That by their speaking lives the world may learn
First filial duty, then divine.'

Hubert Handley.

BOOK REVIEWS

A FAIR PROSPECT OF RELIGION*

There is much to be gained by looking at things with which we are familiar from the point of view of a spectator. The visitor to a seaside resort may, for instance, stroll to the end of the local pier and look back at the town. He sees the promenade and boarding-houses from a new position and probably is surprised at the compactness of the scene. Everything falls into a kind of unity which he had not suspected as he walked through the streets.

It is well now and then to leave behind the atmosphere of religion as we

* *Studies in the Philosophy of Religion*, by A. A. Bowman. Edited with Introduction by Norman Kemp Smith. (Two vols. Macmillan, 1939. 30/-.)

know it to-day. Then we can ask: What is religion? How shall we recognise it? What is the test of the best religion? To these questions the answer given may clear up our thought and confirm our belief. In his *Studies in the Philosophy of Religion,* Professor A. A. Bowman throws useful light on this aspect and puts before us an attractive discussion of this fundamental topic. His two volumes are a lucidly substantial contribution to a subject upon which every Christian teacher and preacher should have distinct ideas.

To consider religion from an observer's distance is to notice one very interesting thing at once. This is that we have not simply to aver that God exists or does not exist, and base everything upon this issue. In much popular debate this is thought to be the main point of contention. Yet, as our opening chapters on the approach to the subject reveal,

> 'there is not here substance enough to constitute the content of any genuine belief. It is a fundamental error to suppose that we can know of God's existence and know nothing more about Him. There is no practical, and almost no theoretical, difference between believing in nothing but God's existence, and not believing in His existence at all.'

Our spectator, so to speak, as he surveys the shore, sees that there is a town there, and in the same glance he also sees that it is some kind of town with a character and appearance peculiar to it. He does not observe mere lines and shapes and spaces. Religion is not defined by logic but by its rational, moral and spiritual content. Its effects in the lives of believers are essential evidence for any estimate of the nature of religion. The kind of God we believe in is of first importance, and not the fact that God either does or does not exist.

Take a thoughtful look at that strange mixture of magic and ritual that makes primitive religions such a fascinating science. The Old Testament contains records of primitive rites, and various sorts of paganism continued in New Testament times and were denounced as superstition by the Christian writers of the early centuries. Professor Bowman offers us a very handy term to describe all these grotesque observances of ancient religion. We may be thankful for a thread that takes us through such a tangled maze. This term is *personalism*. Primitive people thought of outside objects of nature as having a personal life of their own. This explains why they could worship trees, rivers, thunder, wind, etc.

> 'The statement that primitive man personifies nature must be taken to mean, not that he imparts personality into nature, but that he has not learned to abstract personality from her. It is not so much that he has a clear notion of the personal, as that he has none whatever of the impersonal . . . What he does is to attribute to nature in general the same capacity for free movement and responsible action which he discovers in his own body and in the bodies of his fellows.'

Connect this notion of 'personalism' in primitive religion to the idea of evolution, and you have an explanation of how his increasing control of nature has given man a more complete knowledge of himself and his own

nature. Modern religion as it has evolved from the primitive attitude is concerned with man knowing *himself* as a rational, moral and spiritual being. Christianity, in fact, presents us with a classic instance of a self thus aware of its nature.

We are indebted to Professor Bowman for another disentanglement of a characteristic of both primitive and present religion. This he gives us under the formula *rites de passage*. Life is the practical problem in every age, and adjustment to life is involved in all forms of religious ceremonial. Primitive man has no conception of causality in our sense of this term. He sees the events of life as the operation of the occult powers. He marks the successive phases by ceremonial in order to identify himself with the unseen reality.

> 'The *rites de passage* are therefore to be understood not merely as a ceremonial of transition but even more essentially as a ceremonial of self-identification, which is the same thing as self-realization. The savage progressively realized his existence by meeting each of the recurrent changes in the life-process with an act of symbolic ritual whereby he equates his personal identity afresh with the comprehensive identity of that unseen reality which remains one throughout all its fluxations.'

The curious reader will recall how these 'rites of passing' from one phase of life to another are retained in our Christian Church. This does not mean that the ceremonies of baptism, marriage, the entry into adult status by confirmation, or the 'last rites' are of a piece with primitive religion. They are suggested by the phases of life, but they have been given a higher meaning proportionate to the advance to Christian belief.

We should like to include reference to the able treatment of such aspects of religion as *neutralization of sin* and *idealization* or the ideal extension of experience and the implication of a future state of being. We must be content to give a sample of the Professor's range and clarity by citing his assessment of the position of religion in the present day:

> 'There can be no doubt that among the characteristic phenomena of our maturing western civilization is the evolution of a secular, in place of a religious, attitude to life . . . In the course of centuries, man has learnt to relate himself as a person to nature as a set of impersonal forces. So far as the western world is concerned, it would not be too much to say that man hardly knows what to do with his religion, or where to find a place for it in the circle of his interests. It has very largely ceased to be the *normal*—it is probably seldom the *paramount*—business of life.'

There are various explanations for this state of things. Many people think that the day of religion is over: others assert that worldly men and women are blind to essential values. None the less, the lack of popular interest in the churches is a modern fact. The Professor's view is that this contemporary secular period is part of the evolution of religion. We might say that a new religious man is being evolved out of the present secular man. People live and move in a world which they treat as their own, in which they think that they are independent, self-sufficient, and, as it were,

gods in their own right. This is the secular outlook to-day. It is the business of the religious teacher to correct this and to define to present-day man his true nature, to help him to see himself as a finite, imperfect being in relation to the infinite.

> 'The development of a secular standpoint can be understood only from the religious point of view. It is a phenomenon of the process by which religion advances beyond its animistic beginnings . . . In the world of finite things man lives and moves, and, until its finite nature is clearly realized, the nature of the true infinite will remain more or less obscure. There will be a constant danger of confusing it with the finite. To eliminate this tendency is among the functions of religion. Religion in this aspect is the progressive definition of the Infinite through a clearer realization of what it means to be a finite being . . .'

Canon Streeter once remarked that a return to organized religion might be expected in about fifty years. Such forecasts are not entirely speculative. We must allow some time for man's secular knowledge of himself and the world which received an impetus from the Education Acts of recent date to become, so to say, less conceited, and to fall into its proper place. We must also permit the new understanding of the literature of Christianity to permeate into the popular mind. The disposal of traditional items without present value has already begun. It is conceivable that in the not distant future a real advance from the secular to the spiritual will take place. All the time, of course, the Christian teacher uses his faith and vision to promote this development. We can feel grateful to Dr. Bowman, who, as Professor Norman Kemp Smith tells us in his memorial introduction, 'habitually lived with entire naturalness and simplicity on a spiritual level to which all but a very few attain only by effort and intermittently,' for philosophical encouragement in our task. He has been able to stand at a convenient distance and to give us a perspective view of religion. This enables us to see whence we have come, where we are, and what the future may yield. These volumes are of a somewhat specialized character. But any clergyman who wants material for a course of talks to a discussion group or a good 'quarry' for a series of sermons on what religion means will find in them all that he needs. They should certainly be placed on the shelves of clerical lending libraries as soon as possible.

J. R. McCallum.

GOD IN HISTORY*

The main theme of Professor Macmurray's *Clue to History* is that behind the whole of our Western thought there is a dualism which regards the spiritual and material worlds as distinct and indeed antagonistic; that Hebrew thought made no such distinction, regarding spiritual and material as one realm; that Christianity inherited this outlook from Judaism, but has never yet succeeded in overcoming the natural dualism of the West; and that finally the only hope of Europe and of the world is the recognition

* *The Clue to History.* By John Macmurray. (S.C.M. Press. 1938. 7/6.)

of the totalitarian claim of religion to rule the whole of life, spiritual, mental and material. Following this main theme is one which, to the author's mind, provides the clue to history, *viz.* that

> 'human intentions which are opposed to the intention of God for man are necessarily self-frustrating. When men set out to realize an intention which is contrary to the divine intention, they do not achieve it. They achieve something that they did not intend.'

These themes, developed at length, are of great interest, and deserve very careful consideration for the light that they throw on history, even if their application cannot alone unlock its secrets. The author warns us in his Preface that the subject is difficult because of our own dualistic presuppositions. But it must be admitted that the presentation of the themes is made more difficult by questionable statements which distract our attention from the main theme.

There are a number of places in the book where the author overstates his case, or tries to show the picture in too sharp a contrast of black and white. Thus, while it is true that human progress is not identical with biological evolution, it is not entirely dissimilar. After all, one of the main factors in evolutionary change is the will to survive, or the desire for life, which is as near 'intention' as can be found in the lower creation. There are also a number of places where generalizations are made without proof, and immediately used as links in an argument. We read, for instance, in the chapter on Modern Europe, that 'the suppressing agency in society is the religious organization.' Examples of this might easily be found, but equally easily examples of the exact opposite, that is, of the religious organization as the elevating agency in society.

In the treatment of the Old Testament there are many points with which Old Testament scholars would disagree. It is true that in Hebrew thought there was no differentiation of spiritual and material, and many examples could be quoted, but this failure, so far from being a brilliant synthesis, was actually a primitive trait which was never overcome. When a Hebrew said his soul (*nephesh*) was hungry or thirsty, it degraded the ideal of soul to the bodily appetite — the meaning that the corresponding Arabic word *nafs* generally has. One particularly unfortunate result of this failure to distinguish the material and the spiritual is seen in St. John's use of the word 'flesh' for 'human,' following the common Old Testament expression 'all flesh' meaning 'all mankind.' It would have been more intelligible and truer if he had said, 'The Word became human.' That the Hebrews were content to go without a doctrine of the future life certainly shows that they thought of this world religiously. But that was not the cause of their failure — for failure it was. They failed because they did not carry to its conclusion their belief that Jehovah was the God of the whole universe. In spite of their magnificent religious development in other respects, in this respect they were atavistic: they remained heathen. Modern scholars

recognize that prophecy and not legalism was the characteristic of Judaism. But it must be remembered that prophecy had died out, and legalism and apocalyptic were triumphant, in the days of Jesus. It was Jesus who restored prophecy to its place, and the Jews who rejected Him did not do so. The statement therefore that Christianity is essentially Jewish is liable to misunderstanding. Christianity upholds what Christ believed, and what we believe, to have been essentially characteristic of Judaism; and by doing so, Christianity is in opposition both to the dominant Judaism of our Lord's day and also to the whole of post-Christian Judaism. Failure to recognize this fact is seen throughout the book, where modern Judaism is represented as standing for the spiritual outlook which the Jews definitely rejected in the days of Christ.

These criticisms must not be taken to invalidate the general thesis of the harm done to Christianity by adopting the European dualistic outlook on life. An example may be given in the realm of theology which the author barely touches. The fact that Christ was both God and man was as unintelligible to Leo as it was to Nestorius and Eutyches. For all the theologians of the time Godhead and manhood were separated by an unbridgeable gulf, and their union could not be conceived. While Nestorius and Eutyches denied what was logically unthinkable, Leo asserted the impossible by faith.

The presentation of the main theme of the book is original, and therefore may make a deeper impression than older diagnoses of the world's ills. In substance, however, this new presentation comes to much the same thing as the well-known statement that God cannot be excluded from any department of life, and that religion cannot be treated as an optional 'extra.'

The practical application of the clue to history is unfortunate as regards Soviet Russia. The author says:

> 'There are certain forms of social progress and social conduct, such as the care for the sick, the aged and the infirm, which have been universally recognized as expressions of the Christian spirit. These activities are being developed in Soviet Russia to an extent that no other country has ever attempted.'

And again:

> 'Soviet Russia is the nearest approach to the realization of the Christian intention that the world has yet seen, for the intention of a universal community based on equality and freedom, overriding differences of nationality, race, sex and "religion," is its explicit and conscious purpose.'

Events in Russia since the book was published have shown, if it was not clear before, how completely at variance with the facts is the author's judgment of the condition of affairs there. Russia, more than any other country except Nazi Germany, denies freedom to its citizens. The Russian peasantry are in the depths of poverty, so much so that, we are told, they

look with amazement at the riches of the shops of Eastern Poland, which is known to be one of the poorest districts of Europe. So far from caring for the sick, they have repeated and intentionally bombed Finnish hospitals, and have sent their own soldiers to the Arctic front so badly clothed as to ensure their death from cold. So far are they from promoting freedom that they have taken away the freedom of three small nations and are attempting to destroy the freedom of Finland; to their own soldiers they have denied freedom of thought by concealing from them the true facts of the Finnish war. One fears that the author has been deceived by Russian professions of equality and care for the poor, which are in reality a cloak for the sinister designs of their autocratic rulers, as much as the 'Socialism' of German National Socialism is a cloak for German Imperialism.

Finally, is it true to say that 'since God is absolute it is nonsensical to think that His intention in history will not be realized'? Does the wrath of man always turn to His praise? Does it not depend on human response whether, when the Son of Man cometh, He will find faith on the earth?

L. E. Browne.

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION IN TRAINING COLLEGES*

Considerable interest was aroused by the *Times* article of February 17th, 1940, on Religion and the National Life, and in the correspondence which ensued references were made to the responsibilities of the Training Colleges for preparing their students to give religious instruction in the schools. There was an underlying assumption that to-day, in no small measure, it is the duty of the schools to undertake a task which at one time, at any rate, some would have considered to be peculiarly the function of the homes and churches. Probably no convinced Christian would wish to divest the schools of responsibility for this high task, more particularly at a time when not only the Christian religion, but also Christian standards of morality are being questioned and set at nought.

In some of the letters there was an application, more or less definite, that the Training Colleges are failing to fulfil their duty in this respect and that they are not making adequate provision for their students in this all-important part of their work. It may not be inopportune, therefore, to refer to a Memorandum,* issued by the Two-Year Training Colleges for Elementary Teachers some eighteen months ago, which deserves a wider publicity than it appears to have received.

The Memorandum was written 'for the wide public to which the efficiency of teachers is, or should be, a matter of vital concern,' and the chief reason for its publication is 'the belief that all who are interested in education should have some knowledge of the problems arising in the training of teachers and of the lines along which their solution is being sought.'

* *The Training of Teachers.* (University of London Press. Price 1/-. 1938.)

A brief account of the section on Religious Education may serve to indicate the attitude of the colleges towards this question. The answers to a *questionnaire* recently issued to the Training Colleges justify the claim made in the Memorandum that 'serious attention is being given to the problem in most of the Training Colleges and that there is considerable interest in the subject and in the practical application to social service.' That there is great variety, both in type and scope, in the religious education that is given, is not open to question, but in the two-year colleges it is the exception to find no provision being made for the students' preparation in this respect. There is also, generally speaking, a readiness to recognize that religious education is far more than mere instruction and that it involves the development and training of an attitude towards life.

Accordingly in all voluntary colleges the provision of services is regarded as an important part of the students' religious training and all offer courses of lectures on the Bible and the teaching of Scripture, while Church colleges provide courses on Doctrine, Prayer Book and Church History.

Local Education Authority Colleges too, for the most part, provide courses of lectures on the Bible and make arrangements for daily prayers. Reference is not infrequently made to the willing help and co-operation of local clergy and ministers.

The practice of the Roman Catholic Colleges is definite and apparently more or less uniform. Religious education is part of the life of the college, in which the daily services and definite instruction are both of vital importance.

Denominational Colleges with their own chapels have a great advantage, for in a place that is used only for the one purpose of religious worship there is an atmosphere that cannot be created in any other way. In some of the non-denominational colleges a small chapel or silence room is available and there are various references to its value.

Although the work of the University Training Departments is not included in this short survey, it may be mentioned that in some there are facilities for courses in Divinity on a voluntary basis for intending teachers.

The inclusion of Divinity as a subject in the University Examinations for Elementary Teachers in some of the University areas provides an opportunity for those who wish to obtain an examination qualification in the subject, and there is no doubt that the institution of an advanced course in Divinity gives the subject a better intellectual status in the colleges. There is apparently little desire for an examination of an ordinary course standard, though many would welcome the extension of the advanced course examination to other areas.

In considering the question of religious education in the Training Colleges one vital factor must be taken into account, and that is the previous religious background of the students. It is hardly necessary to say that this varies enormously, perhaps more than in any other subject. Many

enter the college with little or no connected knowledge of the Bible and some with the impression that Scripture is a dull subject. Some wish, through definite personal conviction, to undertake the teaching of the Bible in schools, others are not unwilling, if required to do so, though fully conscious of their own ignorance and personal difficulties, while others would definitely prefer not to be called upon. Whatever be their previous knowledge, any course of religious instruction must be of a scope such as to indicate to students that they are approaching a subject worthy of serious intellectual study in which modern methods of dealing with the Bible will help to dispel much ill-founded criticism and personal difficulty.

Many opportunities exist to-day for young teachers to obtain further help in what is admittedly a difficult task, and reference may be made to the books published by the Student Christian Movement and the ever-growing work of the Institute of Christian Education. The Association for Adult Religious Education has done active work in promoting the institution of University Extension courses in Biblical subjects in different centres, while mention may be made of Church Tutorial classes and Biblical Vacation courses.

That the Two-Year Colleges in the short period of two years can only give guidance in direction will be realized, but that they are taking these initial steps with a definite sense of purpose will also be admitted.

S. E. S. Richards.

THROUGH ITALIAN EYES*

Carlo Scarfoglio, the author of the present volume, comes, the publisher's notice informs us, of distinguished parentage; he numbers among his ancestors, as he tells us himself, Christopher Columbus and the Cabots, who explored North America and launched the ungrateful English on their career of maritime and colonial expansion. To come down to more modern times, his father was the intimate friend and supporter of Crispi, the man who might have been a Mussolini and was the original patentee of the Berlin-Rome Axis. He has been editor of the *Mattino* and the *Nazione*. In 1915 he was a neutralist, against the intervention of Italy in the last world-war, but there is no doubt that he subsequently found salvation as a whole-hearted supporter of the Fascist régime. He loves this country and is anxious to do us an essential service. His service consists in showing us ourselves as others see us. His intent is to smite us friendly and reprove us, but his precious balms are meant to break not our head but our headstrong arrogance.

All which being premised and his kind intentions acknowledged, we come to what we are afraid we must call his indictment. Broadly speaking,

* *England and the Continent.* By Carlo Scarfoglio. (Putman. 7/6.)

all the wars that have taken place in Europe since the Glorious Revolution of 1688 have been caused by England's hypocrisy and covetousness. Her policy towards Continental nations might be expressed in schoolboy slang as: Get them scrapping and pinch their colonies. Mere acquisitiveness, a failing to which the collective sinful posterity of Adam is commonly addicted, would not have led John Bull into these deplorable courses. Self-righteousness, the conviction that he has a divine mission, that he is fighting the Lord's battle, is what blinds him to the flagitious character of his policy. The Puritans read the Old Testament and took over the Jewish claim to be the chosen people of God; Signor Scarfoglio notes that some modern Puritans actually claim to be physically descended from Jacob.

All Englishmen, however, are not equally bad. It is the Whigs, a term which our author employs generically for all Left parties in this country, who are the master criminals. The Puritans discovered to their sorrow that the English people as a whole didn't want to be reformed, so they became missionary-hearted and turned their war against sin into a war against wicked foreigners.

> 'What Cromwell had really founded was a religious democracy, and what he did with this religious democracy was to turn it against the outside world. Thus moral and religious self-righteousness was transferred to the political field and became political self-righteousness. In many ways the transference was a fortunate thing for England. One immediate result was the subsidence of the internecine struggle . . . The Tories had not inherited that spirit of self-righteousness, that consciousness of sin in others, that call to perpetual war, which the Puritans had developed. I don't say that the Tories have ever been above getting their hands on a colony or two, especially as a satisfactory way of winding up a war started and conducted by the Whigs . . . I should hesitate to affirm that had there been only Tories in England, the Empire had not been acquired; but I do say quite definitely that, had there been only Whigs, England had long since rushed to her doom; for there seems to be nothing on earth that can stop a Whig unless a Tory does it' (p. 21).

It must not be supposed that the Italian Daniel come to judgment takes up a prophetic attitude in denouncing perfidious Albion. His tone is one of cynical good humour befitting a countryman of Macchiavelli and Mussolini. He pokes the elderly Narcissus in the ribs and assures him that the halo which he sees round his head in his reflection in the water is a mere optical illusion, and that he is no more a dedicated nation than Mr. Pecksniff was what Mrs. Todgers called him, 'a missionary of peace and love.' We wish we could believe that Englishmen would read this book with any profit to their souls as containing possibly more than a grain of truth. Perhaps if the dose had been sufficiently diluted, the result might have been salutary. But we do not think that Englishmen, at any rate, Whigs, can be induced to swallow such a crude decoction, as in Italy critics of the Fascist régime are forced to swallow large quantities of castor oil. Besides, to tell the truth,

the book is often grossly inaccurate and full of fantastic exaggerations. For example, it is simply absurd to say that the Tories were in favour of the French Revolution (p. 144) or that Palmerston had to be kicked out of the Cabinet early in the morning for having gone to war with Austria during the night (p. 183). Again, we cannot help suspecting that what really rankles with our censor is not our alleged wickedness but our lack of sympathy with Mussolini's civilising work in Abyssinia and our rather half-hearted attempt to impose sanctions. In fact, we could not honestly recommend this book to any Red of our acquaintance, either of the Jingo or Socialist variety; we are afraid it would only make him see Redder.

GAMALIEL MILNER.

A HISTORY OF CHURCH HISTORY *

The Christian Church is a world-wide society nearly two thousand years old. Its history is of the most amazing and varied character. Church historians, however, as a class, do not rank as high as non-ecclesiastical historians. Their histories tend to be apologetic, controversial, credulous, rather than purely scientific. All they write has, with few exceptions, to be taken *cum grano salis*. It must not be supposed that Church historians are consciously dishonest, but if they be convinced Christians it is almost impossible for them to write the history of the Christian Church without bias. Perhaps the greatest historian of the Christian Church was the non-Christian Gibbon, but who shall say that even he was free from bias, since he was convinced that it was the Christian Church which was really responsible for the destruction of the Roman Empire?

Dr. Foakes-Jackson, in his day one of the most influential of theological tutors in Cambridge — it was commonly said that at least ten of his old pupils became Deans of their Colleges — has added to his many didactic volumes *A History of Church History*.*

It is not an encyclopaedia but a collection of readable essays on subjects connected with the writing of Church History combined with appreciations and criticisms of some of the more notable Church historians and their contributions. These Church historians include, of course, St. Luke, Eusebius of Caesarea, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, Adamnan, Bede and Gilbert Burnet. There are besides interesting papers on Augustine's Philosophy of History, the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus and the other Church Orders, Philo and Alexandrian Judaism. There is also an educative, if not brilliant, paper on Anna Comnena, the chronicler of a brief period in the history of the Byzantine Empire, rather than a church historian.

Dr. Foakes-Jackson writes in a plain, common-sense way without sentimentality and without fanaticism. He provides an interesting body of information for readers who on the one hand are not entirely ignorant of the

*A History of Church History. By Frederick John Foakes-Jackson, D.Theol., Hon. Litt.D. (Heffer and Sons, Cambridge. 7/6. 1939.)

subject, nor yet are so well-read in it as to find much of what Dr. Foakes-Jackson writes, although true, not new. A good example of his style and quality is seen in his treatment of St. Augustine's view of the Church.

> 'Now Augustine, like St. Paul, is so great a man that he could afford to be inconsistent. Both were absolutely consistent in their main religious convictions: but, nevertheless, they were not ashamed to adapt themselves to conditions even though they appeared to contradict what they had said on other occasions. Throughout their long lives they showed their greatness by being always learners. This is seen in Augustine's view of the Church. In his career as a bishop, he found it necessary to present the Church in two different aspects. In his controversy with the Donatists, to whom the Church was a national and local affair, he maintained its Catholicity as a world-wide institution. When he encountered Pelagianism, which seemed to deny the constant need of the grace of God for the salvation of His people, he laid stress on the Church of the Elect. When the supreme moment arrived and he had to undertake once and for all the task of overthrowing the old religion, he set himself to explain what the *Civitas Dei* is, and, as far as one can gather, he means it to be less the organised Church than the invisible kingdom of God on earth, which though embodied in an institution finds its expression in a frame of mind, through which those who share it are united in God with the unseen, but ever-present Church. The aim and object of true members of this invisible Church are directed, not to this life, but to that which is to come, and in this lies the fundamental difference between the *Civitas Dei* and the *Civitas terrena* (p. 94 *f.*).

Dr. Foakes-Jackson's book contains many out-of-the-way pieces of information, *e.g.* that Edward Gibbon and Lord Acton were relations.

This readable book will certainly provide intending students of Church History with a guide to the study of the broad principles of the history of the Christian Church.

The proof-reader of Dr. Foakes-Jackson's pages has allowed some errors to escape correction.

H.D.A.M.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*

THE CLERGY AS COMBATANTS.

Sir,

If your contention, that British pacifism is a cause of the present war, is true then it follows that all ministers of religion are partly responsible for the war since they are all treated as *bona fide* pacifists by the government in that they alone (excepting the blind) are not required to sign the military register.

One would, quite logically I think, expect that, if it is right to kill in defence of the 'Christian values,' able-bodied Christian ministers would be in the vanguard of the army, and would indeed have trained themselves

for such a position long before the war started in view of the trend of events. In what way is moral obligation altered by ordination?

E. V. MILNER.

The School House,
Brayton, nr. Selby.
May 25th, 1940.

[Whether clergymen should serve as combatants in war must depend upon the decision of the State. In the Great War a number of students of Ripon Hall who were in Priests' Orders served as combatants and some of them fell in action. In this war the State has declined to allow those in Holy Orders to serve as combatants.

Article XXXVII of the Church of England asserts: 'It is lawful for Christian men, at the commandment of the Magistrate, to wear weapons, and serve in the wars' (*Bellis justis*).

Inasmuch as clergymen are Christian men it is lawful for them to bear arms if commanded by the Magistrate. It is true that the Canon Law forbids clergymen to bear arms, but the Canon Law has no legal authority in this country when in conflict with the Statute and Common Law of the Realm. To-day many French priests are serving as combatants, as are the majority of French Protestant ministers. ED.—*M.C.*]

MODERNIST LEAFLETS.

SIR,

I should be grateful if you would kindly allow me to draw the attention of your readers to three leaflets which have been published by the Union for free distribution. They deal with matters of great interest at the present time, and the co-operation of clergy, chaplains and others is invited to assist in their distribution. So far the following are available, but others will be ready later:—

Why Pray? Ven. W. M. Browne, M.A.

Miracles: Do they happen? Rev. A. R. C. Leaney, B.A., C.F.

Must we change the Man or the System? Rev. H. P. Kingdon, M.A.

They can be obtained *gratis* from the office of the Union, but contributions towards the cost of printing and postage will be gratefully received. The leaflets were published originally as articles in *The Way* for April, 1940.

T. J. WOOD.

548 The Church House, Westminster, London, S.W.1.
June 6th, 1940.

THE RELIGIOUS SITUATION IN AUSTRALIA: ANOTHER VIEW.

SIR,

The article appearing under the title, 'Religious Reaction in Australia,' in your April number, was read by me with much interest and a certain degree of sorrow as I realized that many of the assertions made about my home-land are true. But all the same, what Mr. Watts has written seems to me to give a somewhat biassed and unfair impression of the condition of thought in Australia. Hence I would like to comment on some of the points made.

Numerous protests came from Australian universities, churches, political organisations and private individuals against the censorship especially as it effected political publications, with the result that recent action has

brought about some improvement in the situation. This has been widely approved.

Unfortunately I have to agree with what is said regarding the Australian Press, but I don't think the position is different from that which exists in England or in other democracies of the world. To suggest that Australia is further behind is to contradict impressions I have gained, and others have expressed the same opinion.

After having spent some time 'specialising in education' in England, I am not impressed by the antiquated nature of education in Australia. In fact my honest impression is that Australia, being unhampered by a long past, has been able to make valuable progress. Two illustrations of this are in the matter of co-education, and methods of examination, especially in universities. Admittedly very revolutionary changes still need to be made. Even although the churches may not provide university chaplains, the Student Christian Movement maintains a very vigorous life, being led and supported by leading members of university staffs. The quality of the Movements's publication, *The Australian Intercollegian,* edited by Professor A. Boyce Gibson, and Miss Margaret Holmes, speaks for itself. The Evangelical Union has considerable support too, which may indicate that Mr. Watts is speaking with full justification about religious reaction. But many members have a far more liberal belief regarding the Scriptures than is apparent from their conditions of membership. It may be worth mentioning too that the Melbourne College of Divinity has a long and honourable history. I am not contending that education in Australia is satisfactory, but that these facts should be placed beside those given by Mr. Watts.

Dr. Angus has a widespread popularity in Australia, and it is to be remembered that the Presbyterian Assembly did vindicate him, and that after the unfortunate trial Methodist students attended his lectures again. It should be borne in mind too that many leading theologians, who could not possibly be accused of obscurantism, disagree with Dr. Angus regarding central doctrines of the Christian faith.

Mr. Watts is in a better position than I am to judge concerning the Anglican Church, but my experience leads me to the judgment that the position in Australia is similar in essentials to that in England. There is still a very small remnant, often fairly outspoken, which is concerned with unessentials such as the 'edibility of Jonah and the credibility of Judges,' and from another point of view the perpetual virginity of Mary. But the main body is striving for a doctrinal position, deep enough to meet the needs of the modern world, and cannot be called reactionary except in so far as it shares the growing world-wide interest in what the past has said.

Astrology and numerology are undoubtedly popular in a light-hearted way with a section of the population in Australia — of what country is this not true? One need not travel very far in England, nor search for long in a certain section of the Press, to find strong evidence of this interest. But to imply a widespread recrudescence of these superstitions seems to me to distort the picture of Australian life.

The main object of this letter is to put a question-mark beside much that is said in Mr. Watts' article, and to say that a case can be made out for a very vigorous policy and readiness to accept new truth in a country perhaps not so bound by tradition as this.

C. J. WRIGHT.

Westhill College,
Selly Oak, Birmingham.
May 5th, 1940.

[From our knowledge of Australian religious life it is probably true that it is no worse than it is in England, but this is very poor commendation. The Presbyterian Assembly did not 'vindicate' Dr. Angus. At the seventh of his trials, which had extended over a period of four years, the Assembly declined to decide whether Dr. Angus was guilty or was not guilty of heresy and quashed the legal proceedings against him on technical grounds. Since then we understand new legal proceedings have been opened.—Ed. *M.C.*]

PSYCHICAL RESEARCH: A CORRECTION.

Sir,

May I be allowed to correct an error made by J. K. Nettlefold in his review of Mr. Harry Price's *Fifty Years of Psychical Research* in your May issue, page 86? The reviewer speaks of Mr. Price as having been Secretary of the Society for Psychical Research for many years. Mr. Price has been a *member* of the Society for many years, but has never held any office in it.

No one, whether officer or member of the Society, is in a position to make 'authoritative' pronouncements as to the conclusions to be drawn from its investigations, as the Society during its fifty-eight years of activity has as a matter of deliberate policy refrained from expressing any corporate opinion regarding them.

W. H. Salter,
Hon. Sec., S.P.R.

31 Tavistock Square,
London, W.C.1.
May 20th, 1940.

A QUESTION AS TO THE FACTS OF EASTER AND THE ASCENSION.

Sir,

As a faithful sceptic, I have, as usual at Easter and through to Whitsuntide, been thinking much of the attitude of natural science to the cardinal doctrines of those seasons and am temporarily confirmed in a possible interpretation which I have never seen suggested, perhaps because of its apparent heresy. Will you tell me what the answer to it may be? I cannot suppose it is original, except, as it is, to myself.

Science cannot believe in the resurrection of the flesh, especially, as of Lazarus, after three days. 'Lord, by this time, he stinketh.' But cases are not uncommon where sick men appear to be dead before actual death takes place; and, with the need and custom of quick burial, they may be buried alive — not much of a hardship, if they were actually passing away, almost unconscious, at the time. This, with the commanding power of our Lord's will, is the natural explanation of the raising of Lazarus, of the widow's son of Nain, of the ruler of the synagogue's daughter. Our Lord was a good diagnostician.

So too of our Lord's own burial. Is it not possible that the friends and labourers took it for granted that He was dead and buried Him prematurely?

Death, as you know, takes place bit by bit in the several organs and tissues; it is a convention that death is taken to be effected by the stoppage of 'the tripod of life' — brain, heart and lung. And yet when as a student

at Guy's I was giving an anaesthetic to an old patient, at one moment his breathing and pulse stopped, while he was unconscious, and he was restored after some minutes. Strictly speaking, he died and rose again; the tumour was removed and he lived for a year or two afterwards.

As a young medico, I wondered why crucifixion should cause death. No mortal injury is done to any organ. It is a matter of exhaustion from pain. To make sure, the soldiery broke the legs of the two convicts; but, guessing our Lord was dead, they only pierced His side and the spear let out a few drops of blood-stained ascitic fluid. Our Lord was exhausted and fainted. But He was determined not to give in. His will-power was phenomenal. Is it not possible that He woke to find Himself in the tomb; then, recovering slightly in the cold air of the second morning, set the closing stone rolling down the track — as seen in the modern models, reproducing the Eastern rock-tomb — and crept out?

What was He then to do? He knew He couldn't carry on for long; nor at all with the vigour required. He had given His disciples such advice, instructions and comfort as He thought best to help them to carry His work on. He decided to die, if possible, unrecognised. Where He *was* recognised, He disappeared as quickly as He could.

On these lines one can follow up the reports in the Gospels and understand them without further difficulty. I never have been happy with the psychological explanations. Unless the text is wholly unreliable, the records of His material existence after resurrection, slight as they are, seem to be too many and too definite.

Anyhow, my suggestion makes no difference whatever to the essence of Christian doctrine and the 'coming' of the Holy Spirit — perhaps the most vital of all.

Am I a complete lunatic? Anyhow, please don't condemn me to be burned.

I *hate* so-called miracles. They belong to 'a wicked and adulterous generation' or to an inferior level of culture. Call them phenomena and we are all square. We ought by now to be worthy of our Lord's pure Gospel without such debatable signs of extraneous power.

FRANCIS FREMANTLE.

Bedwell Park,
Hatfield, Herts.
May 20th, 1940.

[We propose to treat at some length in our July issue the point raised by Sir Francis Fremantle.—ED., *M.C.*]

Mr. SHELTON AND HIS REVIEWER.

Mr. Shelton, whose book, *The Credibility of the Christian Faith,'* was reviewed in our May issue (pp. 92-95) writes that a rational Broad Church position is clearly presented in his book but has been ignored by the reviewer. This *tertium quid* between Rome and Agnosticism 'is definitely stated to be a reasonable conclusion which can be accepted by the intelligent man.' Moreover, it is the author's own position at the present time.

We are glad to publish this statement but do not think that our review did Mr. Shelton wrong when it indicated that Mr. Shelton, although aiming at a rational Broad Church position, had failed to secure it as a valid and satisfying *tertium quid* between Romanism and Agnosticism.—ED. *M.C.*